

**Draft Minutes**  
**Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC)**  
**February 23-25, 1999**  
**Doubletree Hotel, Eureka, California**  
**Meeting #55**

<b><u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u></b>	<b><u>PAGE</u></b>
Agendum 1. Review and approve agenda . . . . .	3
Agendum 2. Adopt minutes of the meeting held October 7-8, 1998 . . . . .	3
Agendum 3. Review of handouts . . . . .	4
Agendum 4. Appointment letters . . . . .	4
Agendum 9. Objectives for joint meeting with the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Task Force (TF) . . . . .	4
Agendum 6. Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) update . . . . .	4
Agendum 7. Trinity Task Force update . . . . .	5
Agendum 8. Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Task Force update . . . . .	6
Agendum 24. California Fish and Game Commission considerations/update . . . . .	6
Agendum 10. Clarification of the KFMC's position on the allocation requests from the Resighini and Trinidad rancherias . . . . .	6
Agendum 11. Review of Megatable/Documentation . . . . .	7
Agendum 12. Report on stock/recruitment analysis . . . . .	8
Agendum 14. Report on 1998 fall chinook returns to the Klamath River . . . . .	9
Agendum 13. Public comment . . . . .	10
Agendum 15. Reports on 1998 harvests, to supplement information provided at the October 1998 meeting . . . . .	11
CONVENE JOINT MEETING WITH THE KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE (TF) . . . . .	11

Agendum A.	Introductions and discussion of objectives for joint meeting . . . . .	12
Agendum B.	Additions to agenda . . . . .	12
Agendum C.	Harvest monitoring needs . . . . .	12
	RECONVENE KFMC MEETING . . . . .	14
Agendum 16.	Sea lion predation of salmon in the Klamath River estuary . . . . .	14
Agendum 17.	Report on genetic study of Bodega Bay Test Fishery . . . . .	15
Agendum 18.	Report on mid-program review . . . . .	15
Agendum 18a.	Appointment to California Steelhead Memorandum of Agreement Team . . . . .	15
Agendum 19a.	Oregon proposal for mass marking of Rogue River spring chinook . . . . .	15
Agendum 19b.	Klamath River spring chinook considerations . . . . .	16
Agendum 20.	Constant fractional marking of hatchery fish . . . . .	16
Agendum C (cont.)	Follow-up on harvest monitoring funding needs discussion with TF . . . . .	17
Agendum 21.	Report on 1999 fall chinook stock size projections . . . . .	19
Agendum 22.	Status report on the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) for 1999 . . . . .	19
Agendum 23.	Possible management options under ESA (Endangered Species Act) constraints . . .	19
Agendum 21b.	Accounting for ocean impacts . . . . .	20
Agendum 25.	Miscellaneous issues and considerations affecting 1999 harvests . . . . .	20
Agendum 26.	Public comment . . . . .	21
Agendum 27.	<u>Action: Develop a range of options for presentation to the Pacific Fishery Management Council and other agencies</u> . . . . .	21
Agendum 28.	Public Comment . . . . .	23
Agendum 29.	Assignments to TAT, and other work assignments . . . . .	23
Agendum 30.	Additions to agenda for March and April meetings . . . . .	23

**Tuesday, February 23**

**10:00 am      CONVENE**

**Members present:**

Dave Bitts  
Virginia Bostwick  
L.B. Boydston  
Troy Fletcher  
Paul Kirk  
Jim Lone  
Don McIsaac  
Mike Orcutt (for L. Masten, Jr.)  
Ron Iverson (for M.E. Mueller)  
Dan Viele  
Keith Wilkinson

**Representative Seat:**

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry  
California Inriver Sport Fishing Community  
California Department of Fish and Game  
Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath Conservation Area  
California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry  
Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Hoopa Valley Tribe  
Department of the Interior  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

Other speakers: (see Attachment 1).

**ADMINISTRATION**

**Agendum 1. Review and approve agenda**

Boydston requested a move of Agendum 24 (CA Fish and Game Commission considerations/update); it was put after Agendum 8. He also requested an item to address a letter from the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) to the Klamath Fishery Management Council (KFMC) regarding an appointment to the Science and Technology Review Team under the memorandum of agreement for steelhead (Handout G); it was added as Agendum 18a.

McIsaac moved Agendum 5 (the nomination of the vice chair) to the last day, and moved Agendum 9 (objectives for the joint meeting with the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Task Force (TF)) earlier, between Agenda 4 and 5.

Wilkinson made a motion:

**Motion: to approve the agenda as amended.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

**Agendum 2. Adopt minutes of the meeting held October 7-8, 1998**

Silveira explained that corrections to the draft minutes were submitted by Lone, Viele, and Technical Advisory Team member Scott Barrow, as shown in Handout B.

Lone made a motion:

**Motion: to adopt the minutes as corrected.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

### **Agendum 3. Review of handouts**

Silveira reviewed the handouts (see Attachment 2).

### **Agendum 4. Appointment letters**

Iverson announced that the 12<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Klamath Act was October 26, 1998, and letters would be sent soon to appointing officials reminding them to appoint/reappoint KFMC members. A letter from the Hoopa Valley Tribe was received this month appointing Leonard Masten, Jr. as their representative (Handout C).

### **Agendum 9. Objectives for joint meeting with the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Task Force (TF)**

McIsaac asked members what they would like to see discussed or accomplished. He suggested information exchange between the TF and KFMC, and a succinct statement of the problem: evaporation of funding, and projects going unfunded.

Fletcher said he would like to see a summary of recent KFMC meetings as a recurring item on the TF agenda. He also suggested a discussion of Klamath flow issues and the EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) for the Klamath Project.

Wilkinson suggested an explanation to the TF of the management objectives for Klamath fall chinook, and how that fits with TF objectives.

Members discussed the funding problem, and came up with three strategies: 1) request funds from the TF for immediate “tin cup” needs (CDFG projects that will not be done this year without funding from an outside source), 2) put together a list of “life boat” fisheries monitoring and elicit the help of the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) to lobby for federal fiscal year 2000 (FY2000) funding, and 3) put together a “big boat” list of monitoring needs, and use it to seek a line item in the FY2001 federal budget.

### **GENERAL**

### **Agendum 6. Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) update**

Lone gave an update on PFMC activity in the past 3 months:

- 1) the PFMC met with the PSMFC, the Northwest and Southwest Regions of the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and the Alaska, Northwest and Southwest Fisheries Science Centers to prioritize funding needs for FY2001 (a ten page letter was produced and sent to Washington, DC),
- 2) the chairs of all the fishery management councils across the country met; they discussed the definition of Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) in the councils’ salmon management plans (landowners and the agriculture and timber industries feel the definition is too broad; others feel it is too restrictive),
- 3) a report to Congress was released regarding the population growth of seals and sea lions,
- 4) the “non-retention mortality group” continued to look at hooking mortality issues, including the rates used for different fisheries.

At the upcoming meeting in Portland, the PFMC will take final action on Salmon Plan Amendment 14.

Boydston said the non-retention mortality technical group has heard recent study results on mortality rates. Different fisheries have different mortality rates, because they are prosecuted in different manners. The group agreed on the need for an updated literature review. An independent contractor will do that. Following the literature review, the group will recommend to the PFMC a policy for the application of mortality rates in the fisheries. They will also design a study of hooking mortality.

Bitts expressed concern that EFH language does not include water coming out of dams that are impassible to fish. The water coming out of Iron Gate Dam at times has such poor quality that it kills fish, but people could point to the current definition of EFH and say the PFMC doesn't think it is a problem.

Wilkinson suggested participating in the FERC (Federal Energy Regulatory Commission) re-licencing of the Iron Gate Dam.

McIsaac asked whether members wanted to weigh in on the issue.

Boydston said that if the KFMC raises this issue now, a year into the EFH process, it would be hard to explain why they waited this long.

Viele said he was unsure how water quality would be addressed.

McIsaac deferred the issue until it was clarified.

#### **Agendum 7. Trinity Task Force update**

Mike Orcutt said the Trinity Flow Study Report by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Hoopa Valley Tribe is nearly finished. The flow study report's recommendation is the preferred alternative in the EIS that has been simultaneously written. The report recommends flows be based on the type of water year. In a critically dry water year, it recommends 368,600 acre-feet of annual water volume at Lewiston Dam. In an extremely wet water year, it recommends 815,200 acre-feet. Flows are recommended for temperature control, for chinook holding, and for channel shaping. The minimum flow is 300 cubic feet/second.

Joe Polos, USFWS, added that the study recommends mechanical removal of riparian berms and re-creation of bars along the mainstem Trinity from the Lewiston dam to the confluence of the North Fork. High flows would also reshape the channel.

In response to a question from Fletcher about whether flows would be ramped to protect coho, Orcutt said that issue was not included in the flow study, but it may be addressed in a Biological Opinion the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) is writing.

Regarding the Trinity Task Force, Orcutt said the group has not operated since September, 1998. It was re-chartered in January, 1999. Last year the Trinity Task Force had prioritized \$3 million of its \$4.5 million budget, so at its next meeting it must prioritize the remaining budget. The Trinity River Restoration Program

was given only a \$1 million budget after re-authorization; the Hoopa Valley Tribe and others spent money and effort to convince the Department of Interior (DOI ) to raise it by \$2 million. The BOR later added another \$1.5 million.

#### **Agendum 8. Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Task Force update**

Wilkinson said that this topic had been covered under Agendum 9.

#### **Agendum 24. California Fish and Game Commission considerations/update**

Boydston reviewed events leading up to a decision by the California Fish and Game Commission (the Commission) on Klamath River fall chinook management. On January 27, 1999, Jacqueline Schaefer, CDFG, wrote a memo to the Commission encouraging them to make a policy decision on an allocation for the Klamath in-river sport fishery in order to give the PFMC input by its March meeting. (See Handout I.) The memo presented allocation options for the Commission's consideration. At their February 5, 1999 meeting, the Commission tentatively selected a range of 15-20% of the non-tribal allocation for the in-river sport allocation. At their March meeting, the Commission will take more public comment, and expects to make a final decision on the in-river allocation at their April meeting. They plan to hold a special public input meeting in mid-March in the Klamath area. The Commission will adopt final in-river sport fishery regulations at their June meeting.

Boydston said Schaefer's memo also pointed out the overage in the in-river sport fishery in 1998, and alerted the Commission that they may be approached by other fishing sectors on this issue.

Fletcher asked whether the Commission would look at measures to prevent another overage. He referred to a letter sent to the PFMC by the Yurok Tribe regarding the overage (see Handout J).

McIsaac deferred discussion of that topic to Agendum 14.

### **RECESS FOR LUNCH**

#### **Agendum 10. Clarification of the KFMC's position on the allocation requests from the Resighini and Trinidad rancherias**

Bitts gave a summary of the history of the requests (see Handout D). On February 27, 1998, the Trinidad Rancheria asked the KFMC for a harvest allocation of Klamath chinook salmon. On April 2, 1998, the Resighini Rancheria made a similar request. At their April 6, 1998 meeting, the Council discussed the requests and concluded that it was not within their power to designate a share specifically for the Trinidad and Resighini Rancherias. Members suggested referring the rancherias to the California Fish and Game Commission (the Commission) and the DOI. On July 28, 1998, staff wrote letters to the rancherias referring them to the Commission and the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), and wrote letters to those agencies informing them of the referrals. Bitts did not feel the KFMC had taken a clear or final action on this issue, so he requested it be put on the agenda.

Susan Gordon of the Resighini Rancheria presented an overview of that rancheria's history. The people of the Resighini Rancheria are Yurok, and have the same historical rights as other Yuroks. In the late 1930's, their group was recognized. In 1982, the Rancheria was officially recognized by the BIA as 234 acres on the

Klamath River by the Highway 101 bridge. After the Hoopa-Yurok Settlement Act in 1988, the rancheria was invited to join the Yurok Tribe, but chose to remain on its own. The rancheria has made requests to the Yurok Tribe, the KFMC, the Commission, and the BIA for their own allocation of Klamath fall chinook. Their requests were either denied or referred to another agency. Meanwhile, a member of the rancheria was fined by the State of California for using a traditional gill net. Gordon expressed the rancheria's frustration, and wondered who has the final say in granting an allocation.

Bitts said he felt the rancheria's fishing should not be taken from the non-tribal share.

McIsaac asked Fletcher whom he represents, since the seat he occupies on the KFMC is described by the Klamath Act as "non-Hoopa Indians residing in the Klamath Conservation Area".

Iverson added that the Klamath Act calls for the seat to be appointed by the DOI.

Fletcher replied that the Yurok Tribe sees the seat as a Yurok seat, and that he has always said he speaks for the Yurok Tribe, not any other tribal group. The representation situation was complicated by the Hoopa-Yurok Settlement Act of 1989, passed after the Klamath Act was in place. It has not been clarified since then.

Boydston said that because there are no federal legal fishing rights to refer to, by default the rancherias come under the jurisdiction of the California Fish and Game Commission. The Commission could discuss it further, but he advised the rancheria to ask the BIA for an action from the federal government to recognize their fishing rights.

Iverson said the Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office had received no response to the letter sent to the BIA pointing out the rancherias' requests. When he called the BIA to inquire about any action, they said there had never been a finding of a special right or a clarification by the DOI solicitor, nor had there been a formal request from the rancherias for such action from the solicitor.

Ken King, Trinidad Rancheria, asked why all the Klamath tribal groups were not represented on the KFMC. He said that Fletcher could not "wear two hats" on the KFMC and represent interests outside the Yurok Tribe. He suggested all hats be represented.

Ronnie Pierce, Karuk Tribe, said the Karuk Tribe strongly objected to language included in the letters the Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office wrote to the Commission and BIA about the rancherias' requests: "The Council agreed that the chinook currently harvested by the Trinidad and Resighini Rancherias, like that of the Karuk tribe, are taken from the Klamath in-river "non-tribal" allocation, which is regulated by the State of California." This was erroneous information regarding the Karuk Tribe, and the tribe takes exception to being included in this discussion.

## TECHNICAL REPORTS

### **Agendum 11. Review of Megatable/Documentation**

George Kautsky, chair of the Klamath River Technical Advisory Team (TAT), gave background on the

megatable, a 20 year record of Klamath fall chinook returns tabulated by CDFG from a variety of data sources. Because of confusion regarding the origin of numbers in the megatable, the KFMC asked the TAT to document the sources of the megatable. A group of contributors to the megatable met on January 14, 1999 to discuss documentation. In the future, a brief description of how data were collected and estimates were generated will be distributed with the data. In the past, the megatable has been published in December. The megatable numbers for jack returns are at that point preliminary, and are often revised later. The TAT has pointed out that this compromises the accuracy of the prediction of the abundance of age-3 fish for the next year. The megatable group decided in the future to distribute the megatable in mid-January, when estimates are firmer; (refinement of the fork length cut-off for jacks usually occurs in early January). Methodologies the group intends to review are: 1) recreational fishery monitoring back to 1978, 2) natural escapement in various tributaries, and 3) how jacks are estimated.

Boydston and Scott Barrow, CDFG TAT member, reviewed changes in the megatable this year. The first version of the megatable was dated December 15, 1998. The second version was dated January 21, 1999. The final version was dated February 9, 1999 (see Handout F). The difference between the first and second versions was a correction to the recreational harvest numbers (an increase from 5200 to 7400). The difference between the second and final versions was a correction of the jack numbers at Iron Gate Hatchery (a decrease from 1700 to 500). Adults were smaller than expected in 1998 because of El Nino, so some fish shorter than the 24" cut-off used by CDFG were actually adults. When the TAT met on February 3, 1999 to make the stock abundance prediction for 1999, they had available the results of the age composition analysis done by the Yurok Tribe for fall chinook harvested on the Klamath side. That analysis is based on coded wire tags (CWT's) and scale analysis, and it showed that the jack cut-off used at Iron Gate was incorrect. The TAT adjusted the Iron Gate jack numbers based on the scale data, and understood that CDFG would also adjust the jack numbers in the megatable in some fashion. Mark Pisano, CDFG, did the adjustment, but the TAT has not yet found out what method was used.

Lone asked whether corrected jack numbers were responsible for the increase in the in-river sport harvest overage, and whether fisheries across the board had their jack numbers adjusted in the same way.

Kautsky said he would discuss the in-river fishery further in Agendum 14, but only the tribal harvest and Iron Gate jack numbers were adjusted based on scale data rather than a fork length. The Trinity River Hatchery jack numbers were adjusted based on CWT's.

McIsaac complimented the TAT on detecting and taking action on the jack accounting problem rather than using incorrect data in the prediction.

## **BREAK**

### **Agendum 12. Report on stock/recruitment analysis**

Michael Mohr, NMFS TAT member, reviewed Handout E, the TAT report "Population Dynamics of Klamath River Fall Chinook Salmon: Stock-Recruitment Model and Simulation of Yield under Management", authored by Michael Mohr and Michael Prager of NMFS. The report examines the relationship between long-term yield of Klamath fall chinook to 1) alternative levels of the spawner floor, 2) establishment of a de minimis fishery,



and 3) pre-season stock projection error. It did this by coupling an age structured Ricker stock recruitment model with a harvest rate model and simulating fisheries yield, while following a set of management rules (outlined on page 3 of the report). Mohr explained the methods, figures, and results of the report in detail. The report recommends that the current floor of 35,000 natural spawners be retained. It makes no recommendation on whether a de minimis fishery should be established, however if one were to be established, the study recommends a small minimum spawner reduction rate, such as 10%. The model demonstrated that better precision in the pre-season abundance prediction can increase the average yield from the fishery, reduce the fluctuation in year-to-year yield, and increase escapement. The report recommends that all agencies responsible for sampling and estimation of Klamath fall chinook consider increasing their resources for these tasks.

McIsaac commended the authors on an excellent report. He said that one of the KFMC's questions when the last draft of the report was presented in Weaverville in 1996 was how the 35,000 spawner floor related to the genetic viability of aggregate natural stocks. Some people have suggested that 35,000 is a threshold that is extremely dangerous to fall below from a genetics perspective. This report does not address that question, so McIsaac asked that the TAT look at whether the data since 1978 shed light on that issue, and add that to the report. He also suggested the authors consider an alternative term for "spawner reduction rate", such as "spawner equivalent fishing rate".

### 1998 Management Season

#### **Agendum 14. Report on 1998 fall chinook returns to the Klamath River**

McIsaac asked what happened in 1998 to the Klamath in-river fisheries above the estuary.

Barrow said he believed the overage happened because the Trinity River went from a quota fishery to a season system, yet there was not an adequate creel census funded to monitor the fishery. The fishery was run on a day time-frame based on historical data from the lower river. They didn't realize the fishery went over the quota until after the season closed, because they can't calculate the catch until much later, after all the other numbers come in. A letter from the Yurok tribe to the PFMC regarding the overage (Handout J) cited an angler harvest of 5200 fish (the quota was 1800). As shown in the megatable dated February 9, 1999 (Handout F), that number was revised to 7600 adult fish, due to the adjustment of jacks to adults mentioned during Agendum 11.

McIsaac asked whether the overage took place in the megatable category called "balance of the Klamath system", and why the whole fishery wasn't closed down once the quota was reached.

Mike Rode, CDFG, said the fishery was not run in a way that allowed it to be shut down once the quota was reached. A creel census took place from Coon Cr. to the mouth of the Klamath, and it was subdivided into two sections (above and below Highway 101). The fishery is designed so that once these areas below Coon Cr. catch their part of the quota, a 28 day season takes place on the Klamath side upstream of Coon Cr. to Iron Gate. This upper area is what is known as the "balance of the Klamath system". The 28 day season is a projection of how long it will take the fishery above Coon Cr. to catch their share of the quota, once the fishery below Coon Creek has caught theirs. It is based on older data collected through reward tags. There was no creel census above Coon Cr. CDFG needs money for real-time monitoring of this fishery, and has submitted

proposals in the past that were not funded. The cost would be about \$200,000 per year. Without it, overages and underages are expected, because several factors are quite variable: the accuracy of the preseason projection, the run timing, the size of fish at maturity, and fishing effort. Rode said that in 1998 there was also an anomalous situation, as he described at the last KFMC meeting. The lower river quota had not been reached prior to Labor Day, as a number of fish had been set aside for the weekend. During the weekend there was a spike in the run, and CDFG could not shut the fishery down within a day, so the quota was exceeded.

Boydston explained that the reason the Trinity fishery and the Klamath fishery above Coon Cr. could not be closed down, even though the entire in-river quota had been exceeded in the Lower Klamath, was because the season was set in regulations, with no provision for closure. To close it down would have taken emergency regulations by the Commission, and those could not have been enacted in time to be of use. There is probably a way to write the regulations for 1999 to allow that.

Fletcher said the Yurok Tribe had no complaint about the portion of the in-river overage caused by the change in the definition of jacks vs. adults. However, he stressed the need for a change in the monitoring process, and a provision to close the river once the quota is reached, to prevent the repeated overages in this fishery. If those could not be done, perhaps a bias adjustment factor could be used.

Viele asked about the Trinity side's fishery structure.

Boydston explained that before 1996 the Trinity used the same 28-day system as the Klamath. However, in some years the run never reached the upper Trinity before the 28 days were over. In response to Trinity residents' complaints, the Trinity fishery was switched to fixed seasons set for different sections of the river. The catch is estimated post-season by multiplying a harvest rate by the run size. The harvest rate and run size are estimated using tags applied at the Willow Cr. weir. Whether the fishery goes over depends on how close the predicted run size is to the actual run size. If the actual run is larger than the predicted, there will be an overage, and vice versa.

Orcutt added that there is a creel census done by the Hoopa Valley Tribe below the Willow Cr. weir.

### **Agendum 13. Public comment**

Ronnie Pierce, Karuk Tribe, asked how CDFG estimates the catch between Coon Cr. and Iron Gate Hatchery.

Boydston said it is estimated by multiplying the lower river catch by some factor (about 60%).

E.B. Duggan, Willow Creek resident, said he had looked at the megatable and had three questions: 1) how is the quota established? 2) how is the count estimate made? 3) why isn't the river knowledge of local fishermen considered, since some of them have been fishing since the 1940's? He said he told the KFMC and CDFG in 1998 that, because of the wet winter in 1997-98, the run size would be larger than predicted, and there would be an overage in the fishery. No one took him seriously. He predicted the same thing will happen in 1999. Fishing-based tourism has been essential to the small towns on the Trinity since the timber industry disappeared,

so locals do not want over-harvest. They worked with CDFG to set up the season structure, because under the old system they had fish show up for only three of the 28 days. They are concerned that if the river is closed as soon as the quota is met, they will never have an opportunity to fish– the lower river will catch them all.

Jim Welter, Brookings resident and PFMC Salmon Advisory Sub-panel member, reminded the KFMC that they passed a motion saying that if a fishery is not monitored, it shouldn't be allowed. He asked when the KFMC would take action on this. He suggested the up-river fishery should consider a 1 fish/day, 4 days/week limit like his fishery (the Klamath Management Zone ocean sport fishery).

Bostwick said she was appalled by the overage. She said CDFG closed the lower river fishery quickly before the Labor Day weekend was over, that the fishery needs more fish, and that she didn't think the total non-tribal catch exceeded 50%.

Kirk said the Commission conveyed that they are serious about remedying this problem. He said anglers are concerned about over-fishing, and they were only following the regulations.

**Agendum 15. Reports on 1998 harvests, to supplement information provided at the October 1998 meeting**

This item was postponed and incorporated into Agendum 21.

**5:00 pm RECESS**

**Wednesday, February 24**

**8:00 am CONVENE JOINT MEETING WITH THE KLAMATH RIVER BASIN FISHERIES TASK FORCE (TF)**

<u>Members present:</u>	<u>Representative Seat:</u>	<u>Advisory Committee:</u>
David Bitts	California Salmon Fishing Industry	TF and KFMC
Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community	TF
LB Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game	KFMC
John Engbring	U.S. Department of the Interior	TF
Mitch Farro	Humboldt County	TF
Troy Fletcher	Yurok Tribe	TF and KFMC
Ron Iverson (for		
Mary Ellen Mueller)	U. S. Department of the Interior	KFMC
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry	KFMC
Jim Lone	Pacific Fishery Management Council	KFMC
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	KFMC Chair
Elwood Miller, Jr.	Klamath Tribe	TF
Al Olson	U.S. Department of Agriculture	TF
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe	TF and KFMC

Greg Bryant (for		
Don Reck)	National Marine Fisheries Service	TF
Mike Rode	California Department of Fish and Game	TF
Don Russell	Klamath County	TF
Joan T. Smith	Siskiyou County	TF
Dan Viele	National Marine Fisheries Service	KFMC
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry	TF and KFMC

#### **Agendum A. Introductions and discussion of objectives for joint meeting**

John Engbring, TF Chair, made opening remarks for the TF, and McIsaac made opening remarks for the KFMC.

Objectives for the joint meeting were identified: to discuss funding necessities, funding shortfalls, and solutions.

#### **Agendum B. Additions to agenda**

Fletcher asked to discuss common objectives of the TF and KFMC.

Farro asked how the KFMC is addressing the mid-program review.

Bitts asked to describe how the KFMC does their tasks, and asked the TF to describe missions they have accomplished in the Klamath Basin.

Agenda items compiled earlier by the KFMC were:

- 1) Information exchange between the TF and KFMC
- 2) A summary of recent meetings of the KFMC
- 3) Flow issues
- 4) Discussion of management objectives for the TF and KFMC

The chairs decided to address and brainstorm solutions for funding necessities first, then address the other issues.

#### **Agendum C. Harvest monitoring needs**

Fletcher stated that the TF and KFMC need to have common objectives, and that restoration of viable fisheries with harvesting is a common objective. The solution is not just to stop harvesting.

Bulfinch responded that he did not disagree, but the TF does not understand what is needed for the KFMC to complete its tasks. He said it would be useful for the KFMC to tell the TF what tools and data they need and how much those would cost, then ask for a specific allocation from Congress. Representative Herger is interested in the needs agreed upon by the KFMC and TF. These could be attached to the \$100 million item for restoring Pacific coast salmon. Information needs and costs for harvest management and habitat restoration should be identified separately.

McIsaac agreed this would be a good idea. He added that some of the data contribute toward both harvest management and habitat restoration, so further discussion is needed.

Fletcher raised issues that may be common goals, but need further discussion: should we manage for a 35,000 spawner floor? Consider sub-basin stocks? Spend more time on issues and less on meeting business? Is the TF satisfied with KFMC actions?

Olson expressed concern about the use of the spawner floor as a goal versus setting a higher goal. He felt there was agreement that the long-term goal is a productive fishery.

Bitts explained that the spawner floor is not a goal, but a constraint from meeting the harvest goal. Any year the KFMC determines the fishery cannot meet the harvest goal, they manage for the floor.

McIsaac agreed that the optimum number of fish in the basin is an important question. When data are finalized, he suggested another look at the question of population goals.

**Members reached general agreement that a list of harvest monitoring needs would be useful.**

Boydston gave an historical overview of harvest management in the Klamath. Prior to the mid-1970's, there was no escapement or stock monitoring of Klamath salmon. In 1977, the Magnuson Act mandated the monitoring of salmon. At first CDFG used its own resources for monitoring, then the Trinity Restoration Act provided some funding. The Klamath Act of 1986 reaffirmed the mandate to allocate fish and restore habitat, but there has not been enough money to do the job. The Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission (PSMFC) has agreed to seek funding for Klamath River monitoring as a federal budget line item. Congressional help is needed.

Kirk suggested harnessing money from Congress by capsulizing our needs and having appropriate dialogue with our two supportive Congressional members (Herger and Thompson).

Bulfinch suggested that a letter be prepared and signed by non-federal TF members outlining needs. He added that public support is needed.

Bitts said that the Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations (PCFFA) can also lobby for support for the Klamath Restoration program - all they need is an agreed-upon package.

Rode provided the CDFG perspective on short-term needs for this year, totaling about \$50,000. He distributed a memo from Klamath River Project leader Mark Pisano describing the budget shortfalls (Handout N). He said this amount is just a small part of their larger program, which has a much higher price tag.

Wilkinson added that the Arcata Fish and Wildlife Office needs \$150,000 annually for monitoring coho and chinook.

Kautsky provided a list of monitoring components by goals and objectives assembled by the Trinity technical group (Handout O), as an example.

Bitts provided a list of long-term monitoring needs (Handout P).

Bernice Sullivan, BOR, passed around a Basics for Program Management document to provide ideas (Handout Q), and a description of the long-term basic monitoring program for the Sacramento/San Joaquin Estuary (Handout R) as an example.

McIsaac distinguished between both short-term and long-term needs: short-term needs should go into a FY (fiscal year) 2000 budget proposal for reallocation at the Congressional level. Long-term needs should be targeted for FY 2001.

**There was general agreement among members that before final adjournment the KFMC and TF would identify committees to work on short-term and long-term funding needs with the goal of developing preliminary funding packages by the end of the KFMC March meeting.**

McIsaac requested the TF talk about how to proceed with immediate short-term needs-- CDFG monitoring activities that will go unfunded this year, creating data gaps.

## **ADJOURN JOINT MEETING OF KFMC AND TF**

## **BREAK FOR LUNCH**

## **RECONVENE KFMC MEETING**

## **MISCELLANEOUS FISHERY MANAGEMENT**

### **Agendum 16. Sea lion predation of salmon in the Klamath River estuary**

Dave Hillemeier, TAT, made a presentation of the Yurok Tribe's 1997 pilot study of predation on salmon by California sea lions, Stellar sea lions and harbor seals at the Klamath estuary. The study was funded by the TF, with additional funding and technical assistance from NMFS. Study objectives were to:

- 1) directly observe feeding bouts
- 2) assess impacts on inriver fisheries
- 3) collect baseline data on abundance trends of pinnipeds.

Hillemeier showed slides while describing aspects of the study. Observations were made from towers, boats and shore. Bones contained in pinniped scat were analyzed to identify prey type. Stomach contents of pinniped carcasses were analyzed to identify prey type (based on otoliths found). To get an index of pinniped abundance, pinnipeds were censused at high and low tide in the estuary, and at a haul-out area.

Of the observed feeding bouts, 25% took place where the estuary meets the surf. It was estimated that 10,000 fish were taken by pinnipeds. (The 1997 run size was estimated to be 91,600.)

With the assistance of CDFG, 700 fishermen were interviewed to see whether they had lost hooked fish to pinnipeds. Of the 700, 195 had caught chinook or steelhead, and of those, 44 had lost a hooked fish, and 6 had their hooked fish damaged. Hillemeier noted that these losses were not independently confirmed.

Hillemeier said that preliminary data from the continuation of the study in 1998 suggest that more predation occurred in 1997 than 1998. He speculated that a poor prey base during El Nino conditions may have sent more pinnipeds into the estuary.

#### **Agendum 17. Report on genetic study of Bodega Bay Test Fishery**

Viele reported that the protein analysis for the study had not been completed. He also pointed out that the process of developing test fisheries thus far has not been driven by science. The ideas usually come from fishermen, and are hastily drawn up in March. He would like to see more lead time, and input from the TAT on the design and analysis of test fisheries.

Boydstun agreed, and suggested CDFG and NMFS biologists put together guidelines for test fisheries.

McIsaac asked for a report on the Bodega Bay test fishery at the March meeting.

#### **Agendum 18. Report on mid-program review**

Wilkinson said that the Request for Proposals for the mid-program review had been modified by the TF with regard to review of the KFMC. That is reflected in the product.

Fletcher said that Pat Higgins of Kier and Associates was distributing the draft review (Handout S), and there are two weeks in which to make comments. He suggested members look at the draft, because it covers fish population trends, sub-basin status, funding problems, and the consensus process.

#### **Agendum 18a. Appointment to California Steelhead Memorandum of Agreement Team**

Boydstun invited the KFMC to send a technical representative to sit on the Scientific and Technical Review Team established under the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between CDFG and NMFS (see Handout G). He explained that by an oversight the Review Team did not include a tribal representative, and CDFG hoped that a representative from the KFMC could help represent the tribes.

Orcutt said that the Hoopa Valley, Yurok and Karuk tribes sent a letter requesting tribal representatives on the Review Team. Although CDFG offered a KFMC representative as a solution, the tribes feel strongly that they should be included. Fletcher agreed.

Boydstun said that all TAT and tribal biologists are welcome to attend the meetings, but that CDFG is looking for one figurehead.

#### **Agendum 19a. Oregon proposal for mass marking of Rogue River spring chinook**

Steve King, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), presented that agency's proposal to mass mark hatchery spring chinook at the Cole Rivers Hatchery in order to allow a selective fishery on surplus hatchery stocks (see Handout T). Benefits of the program are expected to be 1) improved estimates of wild and hatchery contributions to juvenile out-migrations and in-river adult returns, 2) reduced harvest impacts on wild fish (the natural Rogue spring chinook stock has been declining), and 3) opportunity to selectively harvest surplus hatchery fish. Of the 1,600,000 fish released from the hatchery, 125,000 are proposed to have CWT's and their adipose fins clipped, 100,000 will be double-index tagged (CWT without fin clip) to detect

the catch-and-release mortality, and 1,375,000 will be adipose fin clipped only. The disadvantage of the program is that the adipose clip would no longer be restricted to fish with CWT's, adding an expense to ocean fisheries sampling. More fish heads must be processed, or electronic tag detection must be used. The number of ad-clipped fish in California is expected to be increased by the proposed program by 12%. However, because the selective fishery would be conducted in-river only, there would be no effect on the analysis of CWT data from ocean fisheries.

Bitts wondered whether the increased harvest rate on hatchery fish would intensify the fishery and increase hooking mortality, thus undoing the benefits of the selective fishery.

Fletcher asked whether additional assessments of hooking mortality of wild fish were to be done, to look at the effects of multiple catch-and-release and different gear.

McIsaac replied that the double index tagging incorporates all effects.

Fletcher was concerned about the KFMC setting a precedent by buying into a selective fishery.

McIsaac said they were not suggesting there be mass marking in California, but were asking the KFMC to identify fatal flaws in the proposal. They want to avoid negatively affecting existing CWT efforts and the KFMC process.

Boydston said he would discuss it with CDFG ocean project staff and respond later.

#### **Agendum 19b. Klamath River spring chinook considerations**

Fletcher said the Yurok Tribe is actively managing for spring chinook, and is the only in-river group voluntarily reducing effort to protect spring chinook. He said the in-river fishery is increasingly targeting spring chinook. He observed 30 sport boats fishing at the mouth of the Klamath in July. He urged the KFMC to address management objectives for spring chinook.

Orcutt said that NMFS was reconsidering the lumping of Klamath spring and fall chinook together in the same ESU (Evolutionarily Significant Unit).

Viele said that NMFS received many comments asking for the separation of the spring and fall races, and was looking harder at separation. However, separation would require going through the proposed listing process again.

Fletcher and Viele said there are spring chinook and fall chinook management units in the PFMC's Salmon Plan Amendment 14, but these are place-holders.

#### **Agendum 20. Constant fractional marking of hatchery fish**

Orcutt introduced Dr. David Hankin, Humboldt State University.

Hankin distributed a handout (Handout U). He said the Hoopa Valley Tribe organized a meeting in December,



1998, attended by 25-30 fisheries biologists from various agencies, to discuss constant fractional marking of hatchery fish. It was clear from the meeting that constant fractional marking is an alternative approach to mass marking that should be considered not only at the Trinity River Hatchery (TRH). Constant fractional marking of hatchery fish allows a more accurate estimate of the number of wild fish than the current marking program. Hankin said he originally published the concept in 1982, but with the help of statistician Ken Newman has updated and refined his ideas. At the October KFMC meeting, Hankin presented the results of his study of TRH that showed that the hatchery's estimates of the numbers of fish in their ponds were very different from Hankin's estimates based on systematic sampling. To achieve constant fractional marking, you must know the number of fish marked, and TRH has indicated that they could change some practices to do that. Hankin and Newman ran a simulation of the chief sources of error in the estimation of the proportion hatchery fish in the run using constant fractional marking, including the percentages of yearlings and fingerlings tagged, and the efficiency of the weir. Even with 100% marking, there is some error due to sampling. Their recommendations are to: 1) change some TRH inventory procedures, 2) mark 40% of fingerlings and yearlings at TRH, 3) consider relocating the Willow Cr. weir to somewhere on the Hoopa Square, and staff it for a fixed 5 day/week schedule.

Hankin noted that selective fisheries on adipose-clipped fish may negatively affect estimation using constant fractional marking. He and members discussed ways to get around the problem.

Kautsky said that distinguishing wild and hatchery fish by scale analysis is a goal. Hankin said this was possible, but distinguishing spring and fall chinook by scales is hard.

## **RECESS**

**Thursday, February 25**

**8:00 am RECONVENE**

### Members present:

Dave Bitts  
Virginia Bostwick  
Troy Fletcher  
Paul Kirk  
Jim Lone  
Don McIsaac  
Mike Orcutt (for L. Masten, Jr.)  
Ron Iverson (for M.E. Mueller)  
Dan Viele  
Keith Wilkinson

### Representative Seat:

California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry  
California Inriver Sport Fishing Community  
Non-Hoopa Indians Residing in the Klamath Conservation Area  
California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry  
Pacific Fishery Management Council  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
Hoopa Valley Tribe  
Department of the Interior  
National Marine Fisheries Service  
Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

### **Agendum C (cont.) Follow-up on harvest monitoring funding needs discussion with TF**

Members discussed how the TAT might participate with the TWG in the ranking of proposals, as a means to increase the likelihood of the TF funding monitoring projects used for harvest management.

Jim Waldvogel, TAT and TWG member, explained how the proposal ranking process works. He said that although he tries to influence the process to support harvest monitoring, it is difficult for one person out of 14 to have much effect.

McIsaac said he felt the KFMC should take on this job rather than the TAT.

Fletcher made a motion:

**Motion: That the KFMC recommend to the TF that harvest monitoring technical review needs to be coordinated between that TAT and the TWG, including that proposals received related to harvest management be jointly reviewed by the TAT and TWG.**

**Motion passed, McIsaac abstained.**

McIsaac asked the members to consider how to ask congressional representatives for funding this spring as Congress works on the FY 2000 budget.

Bitts made a motion:

**Motion: that the KFMC sponsor and organize a meeting of a subgroup of its technical team, including representatives from the USFWS, Yurok Tribe and Hoopa Tribe, and one or two representatives from CDFG (perhaps representing both the Klamath and Trinity sides), to be chaired by Bruce Halstead (USFWS Arcata). The purpose of the meeting is to generate and agree on a program of essential fishery monitoring needs.**

McIsaac made a friendly amendment that was accepted by Bitts:

**Friendly amendment: the purpose of the meeting is to generate and agree on a program of essential fishery monitoring needs for which a line item in the FY 2000 federal budget will be sought.**

After discussion, Bitts made an addendum:

**Addendum: to replace Bruce Halstead with Joe Polos (USFWS and TAT member), and to add the Forest Service to the group.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

McIsaac asked the subgroup to present its work at the March meeting, on Wednesday. He asked the KFMC to next discuss the formation of a committee to address long-term funding.

Kirk made a motion:

**Motion: that a long-term monitoring needs committee be facilitated by Bernice Sullivan, using her planning document; that the committee include 1 KFMC representative, 1 Task Force representative, 1 crossover representative, and technical people as needed; that these representatives be selected at the April KFMC meeting; and that they bring their results back at the subsequent fall meeting.**

During discussion, Bitts and Fletcher pointed out that Sullivan is extremely busy, and suggested the USFWS facilitate. Polos and Iverson said that recently-appointed KFMC member Mary Ellen Mueller has extensive experience with federal funding, and she would probably attend her first KFMC meeting in March.

After further discussion, Kirk made an addendum:

**Addendum: to establish the committee now, to name Wilkinson as the KFMC representative and Fletcher as the crossover representative, and to name Iverson as an interim chair while still including Bernice Sullivan as a committee member.**

**Motion passed unanimously.**

## **BREAK**

### 1999 MANAGEMENT SEASON

#### **Agendum 21. Report on 1999 fall chinook stock size projections**

Kautsky referred members to Handout H, the TAT report “Ocean Stock Size Projections and Appropriate Harvest Levels for Klamath River Fall Chinook, 1999 Season”. He said that this year we must manage to safeguard the natural spawner floor, leaving an opportunity to harvest 29,900 fall chinook. He reviewed the methods used in the abundance projection. The method used for calculating the natural spawners was the same as last year’s.

Members asked about improving the predictor; Kautsky said the team is working on improvements, especially for prediction of age-3 fish.

#### **Agendum 22. Status report on the Klamath Ocean Harvest Model (KOHM) for 1999**

Kautsky explained that the revised KOHM won’t be ready for use this year. The KOHM used in 1998 will be used this year, and the TAT wants to avoid any tinkering with the model.

Mohr said that last year the TAT went through an exercise of looking at long term rates in the model, but that exercise does not need to be done every year. Regarding the long-term revision of the model, Mohr expressed concerns about the quality of the databases going into the model. The databases must be organized and quality checked before the model revision can proceed. That is not a small task. Those responsible for the databases understand the issues, but it is unclear whether CDFG can address them in a timely fashion, so that the model revision can be used in 2000. Mohr said Scott Barrow is doing his best, but there should be two people doing his job.

#### **Agendum 23. Possible management options under ESA (Endangered Species Act) constraints**

Viele said no major changes are expected for this year. There are currently 5 ESU’s listed:

- Sacramento River Winter Chinook (no changes in consultation standards)
- Snake River Fall Chinook (no changes)
- Central California Coho (no changes)

Oregon Coastal Coho (NMFS has a draft biological opinion that uses the exploitation rates outlined in Salmon Plan Amendment 13 as consultation standards) Southern Oregon/Northern California Coho (the consultation standard is a <13% ocean exploitation rate. The southern subunit of OCN (Oregon Coastal Naturals) is in this ESU. There is an interim 4(d) rule that permits higher exploitation rates on Rogue coho. NMFS is trying to harmonize this with the ESU consultation standards by having fish taken in the river or at the mouth.)

Bitts said Amendment 13 allows a 0-15% exploitation rate, and asked whether Viele expected the PFMC set a rate below 10%. Viele said he did not.

#### **Agendum 21b. Accounting for ocean impacts**

Kautsky said he added this agendum in response to a member's question. He distributed Handout V, showing comparisons of pre-season and post-season estimates of catch, Klamath impacts, and catch projections. The post season catch estimate was greater than the pre-season estimate for the ocean fishery north of the KMZ and for the in-river sport. The post season catch estimate was less than the pre-season estimate for the ocean fisheries from the KMZ and southward, and for the tribal fisheries. There were no tags recovered at all in the KMZ troll fishery, even though the sampling rate was the same as in the past (20%). Overall, across all the KOHM fishery areas, the pre- and post-season estimates of Klamath impacts were very close (the ratio of pre/post was 1.03-- see Table 2 of Handout V).

Bitts said that the California KMZ troll came nowhere near their quota of 6000 (Barrow said they caught 2400), and effort and landings were way down.

Barrow said that over all of the coast, 151 Klamath tags were returned (about 200 last year). For age 4 fish, 48% of the tags were recovered in Oregon (3199 fish), and 52% in California (3422 fish). The preseason sharing agreement was 54% Oregon/45% California.

#### **Agendum 25. Miscellaneous issues and considerations affecting 1999 harvests**

Fletcher said he would seek language recognizing the overage in the sport fishery and actions to prevent future overages.

Bitts said there was a proposal being developed for a "bubble fishery" in May in Ft. Bragg. There are signs of a gradient in the distribution of Klamath fish from inshore to offshore, with Klamath fish found mostly offshore. There were no Klamath tags recovered in the Bodega Bay test fishery-- this fishery would be an extension of that.

McIsaac asked whether a listing determination on northern salmon stocks (e.g. in Puget Sound and the Mid-Columbia) would affect the Northern Oregon cell in 1999. Viele said on March 10, 1999, NMFS would make an announcement regarding listing of four northern stocks, but did not feel it was likely to affect KFMC fisheries. There will not be a biological opinion released in the middle of the PFMC process. NMFS will send out a guidance letter that lays everything out. NMFS is considering a 6 month delay on listing four ESU's of chinook salmon: Central Valley spring chinook, Central Valley fall chinook, Southern Oregon and California Coastal chinook, and Snake R. fall chinook.

Kirk pointed out that the CDFG and in-river sport representative seats were not present. He asked Scott Barrow to convey the actions about to be taken to Boydstun. He hoped the message would be conveyed to the Commission, Bostwick, and up-river people.

#### **Agendum 26. Public comment**

E.B. Duggan, Willow Creek resident, distributed Handout W to illustrate his comments. He proposed the following measures for the in-river sport fishery: 1) reduce the 28-day period for fishing above Coon Cr. to 21 days, 2) assign specific numbers to angler's punch cards (for example, an angler could get up to 10 fish/season, but still keep 2 fish/day, 4 fish/week--this is needed for tourists who come from far away), 3) split the in-river allocation as follows:

- 20% --Mouth of Klamath to 101 bridge
- 25% --101 bridge to Coon Creek
- 5% --Held over for Labor Day weekend
- 25% --Upper Klamath
- 12.5% --Lower Trinity
- 12.5% --Upper Trinity

Duggan asked the Council to ask the CDFG to increase their budget for monitoring the in-river fishery where it is not currently monitored. In response to a question from Wilkinson, he said he would support a study of hook-and-release mortality.

Kirk observed that when the lower river closes, effort shifts to the Trinity, rather than up the Klamath.

#### **RECESS FOR LUNCH**

#### **Agendum 26 (cont). Public comment**

Michael Lau, CDFG, Klamath River Project, clarified that 5% of the quota is currently held over for Labor Day, that the Iron Gate Hatchery does not turn spawners back into the river after their egg quota is met, and that there is monitoring above the Willow Cr. weir by a reward tag system. He said that half of the in-river sport overage was due to the change in the jack cut-off, and that he would like to see a creel census station set up at Junction City.

Jim Welter, Brookings, said the KMZ sport fishery doesn't have a problem with a 1 fish/day limit, although they haven't caught their allocation, because they maintain a conservative approach. Kirk agreed.

#### **Agendum 27. Action: Develop a range of options for presentation to the Pacific Fishery Management Council and other agencies**

Fletcher offered to draft a letter to the Commission regarding the in-river overage.

McIsaac asked that there should be forgiveness, but that the overage should not be taken as incentive to increase the harvest, because that encourages other fisheries to go over. He suggested incorporating Duggan's suggestion into the options for public review.

Members discussed options and developed the matrix below.

Wilkinson made a motion:

**Motion: to adopt the options outlined in the matrix below for modeling purposes.**

**Motion passed, Fletcher and Orcutt abstained.**

**Suggested Range of Options  
1999 Season**

	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>Commercial</b>	<b>50/50 sharing of age 4 fish</b>	<b>equal opportunity as negotiated by SAS</b>	<b>1998 pre-season sharing</b>
<b>KMZ</b>	<b>1 fish bag limit 1998 season (55 days), plus 14 days in Sept</b>	<b>1 fish bag limit 68 day season, plus 14 days in Sept, as per Coalition request</b>	<b>1 fish bag limit 74 day season, plus 14 days in Sept, as per Coalition</b>
<b>Tribal</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>River:</b>			
<b>--share</b>	<b>.15 of non-tribal share</b>	<b>.15 of non-tribal share</b>	<b>.20 of non-tribal share<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>--sub quotas</b>	<b>25% Mouth to 101 bridge 25% 101 to Coon Creek 25% Upper Klamath 12.5% Lower Trinity 12.5% Upper Trinity</b>	<b>same as Option I</b>	<b>same as Option I</b>
<b>--bag limits</b>	<b>1 fish/day 4 fish/week 5 fish/season</b>	<b>1 fish/day 4 fish/week 10 fish/season</b>	<b>2 fish/day 4 fish/week no season limit</b>
<b>--days open</b>			
<b>Mouth to 101 bridge</b>	<b>9/1-9/6</b>	<b>twice the days in option I</b>	<b>three times the days in option I</b>
<b>101 to Coon Creek</b>	<b>9/3-9/12</b>		
<b>Upper Klamath</b>	<b>10/3-10/17</b>		
<b>Lower Trinity</b>	<b>9/24-10/3</b>		
<b>Upper Trinity</b>	<b>10/3-10/10</b>		

**1/ Oregon fisheries held harmless to increase of 5%**

McIsaac distributed Handout X, a draft letter from the KFMC to the Commission, containing comments regarding the inriver sport fishery.

Wilkinson made a motion:

**Motion: to accept conceptually the draft letter from the KFMC to the California Fish and Game Commission regarding the inriver sport fishery.**

**Motion passed, Fletcher and Orcutt abstained.**

#### **Agendum 28. Public Comment**

No comments.

#### **Agendum 29. Assignments to TAT, and other work assignments**

The following assignments were made to the TAT:

Short term:

In cooperation with Joe Polos, a subset of the TAT will work along with others such as Mike Rode and Bob McAllister of CDFG to develop a package of essential monitoring for fisheries for FY 2000, to give to the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission by March 10.

Meet with and assist CDFG with making recommendations on the inriver sport fishery, as Boydston requested.

Work on the stock abundance predictor.

Make revisions to the Stock Recruitment Report (submitted to Mohr in writing by McIsaac), and finalize the report by the April meeting.

Long term:

Revive the investigation into spring chinook management, and report progress at October 1999 meeting.

Collect all Technical Advisory Team reports going back to 1985, and cooperate with the Yreka Fish and Wildlife Office to catalog and write abstracts for them. To be completed by June 2000.

At some time in the future, look at the correlation between the size at age of downstream migrants with their survival at age 3.

#### **Agendum 30. Additions to agenda for March and April meetings**

McIsaac said the March agenda should include loose ends from this meeting, reports from the TAT, and further development of the recommendation to the PFMC.

**ADJOURN**

**PARTICIPANTS**  
**KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**February 23-25, 1999**  
**Doubletree Hotel, Eureka, California**  
**Meeting #55**

**KFMC Members (or alternates):**

Dave Bitts	California Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry
Virginia Bostwick	California In-river Sport Fishing Community
L.B. Boydston	California Department of Fish and Game
Troy Fletcher	Non-Hoopa Indians residing in the Klamath Conservation Area
Paul Kirk	California Offshore Recreational Fishing Industry
Jim Lone	Pacific Fishery Management Council
Don McIsaac	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mike Orcutt	Hoopa Valley Tribe
Ron Iverson	Department of the Interior
Dan Viele	National Marine Fisheries Service
Keith Wilkinson	Oregon Commercial Salmon Fishing Industry

**Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Task Force members (or alternates):**

Kent Bulfinch	California In-River Sport Fishing Community
John Engbring	U.S. Department of the Interior
Mitch Farro	Humboldt County
Elwood Miller, Jr.	Klamath Tribe
Al Olson	U.S. Department of Agriculture
Greg Bryant	National Marine Fisheries Service
Mike Rode	California Department of Fish and Game
Don Russell	Klamath County
Joan T. Smith	Siskiyou County

**Other speakers:**

Scott Barrow	Technical Advisory Team (TAT), California Dept. of Fish and Game
E.B. Duggan	Willow Cr. fisherman
Susan Gordon	Resighini Rancheria
Dave Hillemeier	TAT, Yurok Tribal Fisheries
George Kautsky	TAT, Hoopa Fisheries Department
Steve King	Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ken King, Jr.	Trinidad Rancheria
Michael Mohr	TAT, National Marine Fisheries Service
Jennifer Silveira	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ronnie Pierce	Karuk Tribe
Joe Polos	TAT, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Jim Waldvogel	TAT, Sea Grant



Jim Welter                      Salmon Advisory Sub-panel, Oregon Recreational Fisher  
David Hankin, Ph.D.        Humboldt State University

**HANDOUTS**  
**KLAMATH FISHERY MANAGEMENT COUNCIL**  
**February 23-25, 1999**  
**Doubletree Hotel, Eureka, California**  
**Meeting #55**

(Handouts are listed in the order in which they were distributed)

**February 23, 1999**

- Agendum 1: Handout A. KFMC Meeting Agenda, February 23-25, 1999
- Agendum 2: Handout B. Revised Minutes of the KFMC meeting Oct 7-8, 1998
- Agendum 4: Handout C. Letter from Hoopa Valley Tribe to Ron Iverson regarding their appointment to KFMC; dated February 10, 1999
- Agendum 10: Handout D. Minutes & correspondence on the chinook harvest allocation request from the Resighini & Trinidad Rancherias, 1998
- Agendum 12: Handout E. Report from the TAT: Population Dynamics of Klamath River Fall Chinook Salmon: Stock-Recruitment Model and Simulation of Yield under Management; dated February 9, 1999
- Agendum 14: Handout F. Revised Klamath River Basin Fall Chinook Salmon Run-size, In-river Harvest and Spawner Escapement-1998 Season ("Megatable"); dated February 9, 1999
- Agendum 18a: Handout G. Letter from L. Ryan Broderick, CDFG, to Don McIsaac regarding Steelhead Joint Scientific & Technical Review Team (MOA Team); dated February 19, 1999
- Agendum 21: Handout H. Report from the TAT: Ocean Stock Size Projections & Appropriate Harvest Levels for Klamath River Fall Chinook, 1999 Season; dated February 17, 1999
- Agendum 24: Handout I. Memorandum from Jacqueline Schafer, CDFG, to Robert Treanor, CA Fish & Game Commission, regarding Klamath River Fall Chinook Management Recommendations; dated January 27, 1999
- Agendum 24: Handout J. Letter from Troy Fletcher, Yurok Tribal Fisheries, to Jerry Mallet, Pacific Fishery Management Council, regarding the Klamath in-river sport fishery, dated February 9, 1999.

Informational: Handout K. Report from the TAT: Brood Year 1992 Shasta River Fall Chinook; dated February 5, 1999

Informational: Handout L. Letter from Karl Wirkus, USDI Bureau of Reclamation, regarding the scoping process for an Environmental Impact Statement for the Interim Plan for Long-Term Operations of the Klamath Project; dated February 8, 1999

Informational: Handout M.. CDFG Salmon Fishery Information Meeting Handout Packet; dated February 22, 1999

### **February 24, 1999**

Agendum C : Handout N. Memo from Mark Pisano, CDFG, to Bob McAllister, CDFG, regarding the FY98/99 Klamath River Project budget shortage; dated August 4, 1998

Agendum C: Handout O. Summary table of Trinity and Lower Klamath Basin Monitoring Needs

Agendum C: Handout P. Dave Bitt's suggestions for a line item for basic monitoring of Klamath Basin fisheries

Agendum C : Handout Q. Basic Concepts for Program Management provided by Bernice Sullivan; dated February 23, 1999

Agendum C : Handout R. Interagency Ecological Program Quality Assurance and Quality Control Program for Collection and Evaluation of Environmental Data, by the Interagency Ecological Program for the Sacramento-San Joaquin Estuary; dated January, 1999

Agendum 18: Handout S. Draft Mid-Program Review of the Klamath River Basin Fisheries Restoration Program

Agendum 19a: Handout T. Notes and graphics from Steve King's presentation on the ODFW proposal to mass mark Rogue R. spring chinook at the Cole River Hatchery

Agendum 20: Handout U. David Hankin's report to the KFMC on constant fractional marking at Trinity R. Hatchery; dated February 24, 1999

### **February 25, 1999**

Agendum 21b: Handout V. Tables from the TAT comparing pre-season and post-season harvest estimates for 1998

Agendum 26: Handout W. Proposal from E.B. Duggan for Klamath salmon allotment

- Agendum 27: Handout X. Draft letter from the KFMC to the California Fish and Game Commission; dated February 25, 1999
- Informational: Handout Y. Annual report 1997-1998, Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project; dated December 14, 1998
- Informational: Handout Z. Quarterly report October-December, 1998, Trinity River Basin Salmon and Steelhead Monitoring Project; dated February 9, 1999

**Motions from the February 23-25, 1999  
Klamath Fisheries Management Council Meeting**

- 1) Motion: Approve the agenda as amended.** (Wilkinson) Passes unanimously.
- 2) Motion: Approve the minutes of the October 1998 KFMC meeting, with corrections.** (Lone) Passes unanimously.
- 3) Motion: That the KFMC recommend to the Task Force that harvest monitoring needs pertaining to the FY2000 budget be coordinated between the Technical Advisory Team and the Technical Work Group (TWG), including that proposals received by the TWG regarding harvest management needs be jointly reviewed by the Technical Advisory Team and TWG.** (Fletcher) Passes, McIsaac abstains.
- 4) Motion: That the KFMC sponsor and organize a meeting of a subgroup of its technical team including representatives from the USFWS, Yurok Tribe and Hoopa Tribe, and one or two representatives from CDFG (perhaps representing both the Klamath and Trinity sides) to be chaired by Bruce Halstead (USFWS Arcata). The purpose of the meeting is to generate and agree on a program of essential fishery monitoring needs, for which a line item in the FY 2000 federal budget will be sought.** (Bitts)  
**During discussion, Joe Polos replaces Bruce Halstead, and a friendly amendment adds the Forest Service to the group.** Passes unanimously.
- 5) Motion: That a long-term monitoring needs committee be facilitated by Bernice Sullivan, using her planning document, including 1 KFMC representative, 1 Task Force representative and 1 crossover representative, and technical people as needed. That these representatives be selected at the April KFMC meeting, and that they bring their results back at a subsequent fall meeting.** (Kirk)  
**(Friendly amendments: to set up the committee now, to name Wilkinson as the KFMC representative and Fletcher as the crossover representative, and to name Iverson as interim chair while still including Bernice Sullivan).** Passes unanimously.

**6) Motion: To adopt the options outlined in the matrix below for modeling purposes (Wilkinson) Passes, Fletcher and Orcutt abstain.**

**Suggested Range of Options-1999 Season**

	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>Commercial</b>	<b>50/50 sharing of age 4 fish</b>	<b>equal opportunity as negotiated by SAS</b>	<b>1998 pre-season sharing</b>
<b>KMZ</b>	<b>1 fish bag limit 1998 season (55 days), plus 14 days in Sept</b>	<b>1 fish bag limit 68 day season, plus 14 days in Sept, as per Coalition request</b>	<b>1 fish bag limit 74 day season, plus 14 days in Sept, as per Coalition</b>
<b>Tribal</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>River:</b>			
<b>--share</b>	<b>.15 of non-tribal share</b>	<b>.15 of non-tribal share</b>	<b>.20 of non-tribal share<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>--sub quotas</b>	<b>25% Mouth to 101 bridge 25% 101 to Coon Creek 25% Upper Klamath 12.5% Lower Trinity 12.5% Upper Trinity</b>	<b>same as Option I</b>	<b>same as Option I</b>
<b>--bag limits</b>	<b>1 fish/day 4 fish/week 5 fish/season</b>	<b>1 fish/day 4 fish/week 10 fish/season</b>	<b>2 fish/day 4 fish/week no season limit</b>
<b>--days open Mouth to 101 bridge 101 to Coon Creek Upper Klamath Lower Trinity Upper Trinity</b>	<b>9/1-9/6  9/3-9/12  10/3-10/17 9/24-10/3 10/3-10/10</b>	<b>twice the days in option I</b>	<b>three times the days in option I</b>

**7) Motion: To accept conceptually the draft letter from the KFMC to the California Fish and Game Commission regarding the inriver sport fishery. (Wilkinson) Passes, Fletcher and Orcutt abstain.**

---

<sup>1</sup>Oregon fisheries held harmless to increase of 5%